FELLOWSHIP

April 1946 Vol. XII—No. 4

dup c

IN THIS ISSUE:

Non-violence and the Indian Crisis
By MOHANDAS K. GANDHI

•

Mr. Byrnes' Straw Man
By A. J. MUSTE

•

What Does Russia Want?
By VERNON NASH

•

The Way to Peace with Russia
A STATEMENT BY THE F.O.R. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MARCH 12, 1946

•

These Are the Work-strikers
By ERNEST ALLYN SMITH

20 cents a copy $2.00 a year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

THE PRESENT crisis in India, we are told, is a final test of Gandhi's gospel of non-violence.

I cannot so regard it!

The present crisis in India is rather a final test of the Indian people.

I

Gandhi's gospel was tested, and tested triumphantly, many years ago, in the great non-violent uprising of 1921-22. That was a time when hope was high, energy unwearied, enthusiasm unabated, and discipline stern. Revolution was not only in the air but in the hearts of men; and in a demonstration of civil disobedience unmatched in history, the goal was all but won. It was no less a man than Lord Lloyd, the Governor General of Bombay, who testified that Gandhi's movement came within a hair's breadth of succeeding. And it would have succeeded, had not Gandhi at the critical moment called it off. Violence had broken out among his followers. Whereupon Gandhi declared that he must train the Indian people to a truer obedience to *Ahimsa,* that they might be able to sustain their cause upon the high plane of non-violence, and be worthy of the victory non-violence could win. It was not British rule that triumphed, but Indian morale that failed.

In the twenty-five years that have followed this initial movement for independence, Gandhi's method has again and again proved its power, as Christianity, or the method of Jesus, has again and again proved its power. If it has not yet succeeded in winning a free India, as Christianity has not yet succeeded in bringing in the Kingdom of God on earth, it is because it has never yet been tried patiently, persistently and perfectly on an unwavering front. Someone, some where, has always given way, and resorted to violence and bloodshed. This has broken the spiritual spell. Gandhi is as helpless as was Jesus to lead followers who will not follow. As it is not Christianity but Christians who have failed, so, in the same way, it is not the Gandhian principle but Indians who have not stood the test. Hence the Mahatma's cry of protest against the Bombay riots!

The fear of this present critical hour is not that India will not win her national independence. Her freedom is as sure as anything can be sure in the future of a world that may wantonly or wickedly be split asunder by an atomic explosion. The menace of the moment is that India will gain her liberty in an orgy of violence which will wreck her civilization and culture, exhaust her wealth and ravage her life, to the point of disintegration and dissolution now rapidly approaching in Europe. Or that she will be plunged into a sea of bitterness and hate which will engulf her in civil war, and therewith rend her into fragments fatal to ordered and happy existence! The question is no longer what Britain will do with India. She will do what she has to do, with her palsied imperial clutch ever weakening its hold upon an aroused and outraged people. Destiny has spoken its doom upon the *Raj!* The real question is what India will do with herself. Will she ape the West in its resort to the sword for the settlement of great issues, and therewith set her feet in the way of death? Or will she follow her divinely appointed leader, Gandhi, and in his program of organized non-violence find the way to life?

II

But the present crisis is a test not only of the Indian people but also of the British Government.

O, why has Britain not been wise enough in this Indian dilemma to work with Gandhi and not against him? Was ever such an opportunity given an empire to achieve, amid besetting difficulties, a great and mutually beneficial result? Yes, in 1767-75, when George III was given the opportunity to work with George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and their associates, and achieve unity consistent with liberty in America. The real leaders of the colonists desired no break with England. So Gandhi, a quarter of a century ago, had no thought of leaving the Empire. Had Britain clasped hands with the All-India Congress after the first World War, instead of enacting Rowlatt Acts and staging Amritsar massacres, the Mahatma and his followers would have accepted dominion status. They were moderate in demands, and cooperative in spirit. But Britain was obdurate, stubborn, autocratic. She rebuffed Gandhi, arrested him, imprisoned him, outraged him. And when she was ready to grant concessions, it was too late. Not a jot or a tittle less than independence will satisfy the Indian people today.

And now—is it too late again? Too late to settle amicably, happily, creatively, peacefully, what must otherwise be settled with wild disorder, bloodshed, and bitter hate? It all depends upon whether this time Britain is ready, after years of futile opposition and violent repression, to put her fate frankly in the hands of Gandhi and accept his guidance. This is the test of Attlee, Pethick-Lawrence, Whitehall, the Labor Government, the English people—whether they be democratic, whether they believe in freedom, whether they have the peace of the world at heart. And it is a last test—for the alternative is plain. Free India, or chaos!

III

So this crisis in India is a test of the Indian people.

And it is a test as well of the British Government.

The test turns on Gandhi—will India and Britain accept him or reject him?

Gandhi's program, like Jesus' gospel, stands as a law of the firmament. Men defy it, or ignore it, at their peril.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the

Fellowship of Reconciliation

2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Co-Secretaries

A. J. MUSTE • JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

ALFRED HASSLER, *Editor*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY, *Managing Editor*

RUTH ERWIN, *Assistant Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Margueritte Harmon Bro
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Elisabeth D. Dodds
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Wallace Hamilton
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Alfred D. Moore
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Re-entered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

20 Cents a Copy $2.00 a Year

Vera Brittain Coming

Vera Brittain, leading English pacifist and author of *"Humiliation with Honor"* and other books, expects to arrive in this country late this month. She will begin a lecture tour May 5 under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee. She will be in the United States for about two months.

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

April 1946 — Vol. XII—No. 4

Non-Violence and the Indian Crisis

By MOHANDAS K. GANDHI

To FELLOWSHIP *by air mail from Poona, India*

HATRED IS IN THE AIR and impatient lovers of India will gladly take advantage of it, if they can, through violence, to further the cause of independence. That is wrong at any time and everywhere, but it is more wrong in a country where fighters for freedom have declared to the world that their policy is truth and non-violence.

Those who believe in violence naturally will use it by saying: "Kill your enemy; injure him and his property wherever you can, whether openly or secretly as necessity requires." The result will be deeper hatred and counter-hatred, and vengeance let loose on both sides. The recent war, whose embers have yet hardly died, loudly proclaims the bankruptcy of this use of hatred. It remains to be seen whether the so-called victors really have won or whether they have not depressed themselves in trying to depress their enemies.

Some philosophers of action in India improve upon the model and say, "We shall never kill our enemy but we shall destroy his property." Perhaps I do them an injustice when I call it "his property," for the so-called enemy has brought no property of his own and what little he has brought he makes *us* pay for. Therefore what we destroy is really our own. Yet for the destruction too we have to pay, and it is the innocent who are made to pay. That is the implication of the punitive tax and all it carries with it. Non-violence in the sense of mere non-killing does not appear to me, therefore, to be any improvement on the technique of violence. It means slow torture, and when slowness becomes ineffective we shall immediately revert to killing and to the atom bomb, which is the last word in violence today.

The Use of Non-Violence

For such reasons I suggested in 1920 the use of non-violence and its inevitable twin companion truth for canalizing hatred into the proper channel. The hater hates not for the sake of hatred, but because he wants to drive away from his country the hated being or beings. He will, therefore, achieve his end as readily by non-violent as by violent means.

For the past twenty-five years, willingly or unwillingly, the Congress has spoken to the masses in favor of non-violence as against violence for regaining our lost liberty. We have discovered through our progress that in the application of non-violence we have been able to reach the mass mind far more quickly and far more extensively than ever before. Yet, if truth is told as it must be, our non-violent action has been half-hearted. Many have preached non-violence through the lips while harboring violence in the breast. The unsophisticated mass mind has read the secret meaning hidden in our breasts and the unconscious reaction has not been altogether as it might have been. Hypocrisy has acted as an ode to virtue, but it could never take its place. So I plead now for non-violence and yet more non-violence. I do so not without knowledge, but with sixty years' experience behind me. This is the critical moment, for the dumb masses are starving.

There are many ways to apply the canons of non-violence to the present needs of the country. The hypnotism of the I.N.A.[1] has cast its spell upon us. Netaji's[2] name is one to conjure with. His patriotism is second to none. (I use the present tense intentionally.) His bravery shines through all his actions. He aimed high but failed. Who has not failed? Ours is to aim high and to aim well. It is not given to everyone to command success.

My praise and admiration can go no further. I knew that his action was doomed to failure, and I would have said so even if he had brought his I.N.A. victorious to India, because the masses would not have come into their own in this manner. The lesson that Netaji and his army bring to us is one of self-sacrifice, unity irrespective of class and community, and discipline. If our adoration will be wise and discriminating, we will rigidly copy this trinity of virtues, but we will as rigidly abjure violence.

I would not have the I.N.A. man think or say that he and his ever can deliver the masses of India from bondage

[1] The Indian National Army, sponsored during the war by the Japanese for the avowed purpose of liberating India. Some 20,000 Indian volunteers joined the I.N.A.—*Ed.*

[2] *Netaji* is Hindese for "leader," but in the present context it is being used, as by millions of Indians, in reference to Subhas Chandra Bose, leader of the Indian National Army and of the puppet Indian government set up by the Japanese. Bose was reported by the Japanese to have been killed in a plane crash while flying from Tokyo to Singapore, on August 19, 1945. However, he is widely believed to be still alive and to have gone underground. In this connection, Gandhi's deliberate reference to his use of the present tense in speaking of Bose is highly significant. Bose is highly regarded in India as a patriot, if misguided, and a demonstration on his fiftieth birthday touched off the riots in Bombay in January.—*Ed.*

by force of arms. But if he is true to Netaji and still more so to the country, he will spend himself in teaching the masses, men, women, and children, to be brave, self-sacrificing and united. Then we will be able to stand erect before the world. But if he will merely act the armed soldier, he will only lord it over the masses and the fact that he will be a volunteer will not count for much. For that reason I welcome the declaration made by Captain Shah Nawaz[3] that to be worthy of Netaji, on having come to Indian soil, he will act as a humble soldier of non-violence in Congress ranks.

[3] Captain Shah Nawaz Khan, one of the three I.N.A. officers whose court-martial trials provoked widespread demonstrations in Calcutta and Bombay last November, during which 37 persons were killed and scores injured. All three were sentenced to transportation (exile) for life, but the sentences were later remitted.—*Ed.*

Mr. Byrnes' Straw Man

By A. J. MUSTE

TWICE IN RECENT WEEKS Secretary of State Byrnes has placed his great personal prestige and the weight of his office—second only to that of the Presidency itself—back of the campaign to extend the present Selective Service Act and to fasten peacetime conscription for military training upon the youth of this country. Before he spoke, many thought these proposals were doomed in Congress. Today many believe that the draft certainly will be extended, and those who want permanent conscription have had their hopes raised again.

The Secretary of State is the chief exponent and executor of American foreign policy. When at a moment of almost unbearable tension in international relations, he declares that the critical factor in this nation's foreign policy is the maintenance of its armed might and to the adoption of universal conscription, Mr. Byrnes announces the complete bankruptcy of American statesmanship. In the arguments he advances in support of his thesis, he proves the truth of the saying that "the only thing men learn from history is that they learn nothing from history." Consider the principal points in the Secretary's St. Patrick's Day address:

> "No nation is more willing than the United States to participate in any reasonable plan for the general reduction of armaments."

Then why does Mr. Byrnes not advance a reasonable plan for reduction—and abolition—of armaments? Why did he not throw the weight of his personal and official prestige back of the "reasonable" proposals for international disarmament and abolition of conscription embodied in resolutions by Representative Martin and Senators Tydings and Hoey? Whose business is it to advance and support such proposals if not the United States' and, specifically, Secretary of State Byrnes'? What right has he without so much as a reference to these proposals and to similar proposals made by Russia in 1927, to make the provocative proposal that the United States unilaterally adopt conscription?

> "Between 1918 and 1941 there grew up in this country an important body of pacifist sentiment. The dominant theme of this movement was that the way to end war was not to prepare for war . . .
>
> "If the United States were to scrap all its armaments and completely demobilize its Army and Navy, it was said, the force of its example would compel the rest of the world to follow suit. The peaceful instinct which underlay this point of view is an admirable one. The trouble with the idea is that it does not work.
>
> "Without consciously deciding to do so, we actually tried it."

I believe Mr. Byrnes tries to be an honest man, and unfortunately a good many people think as he does about America's course from 1918 to 1941. Nevertheless, the statement that the United States tried pacifism and disarmament in those years is a colossal falsehood!

Peacetime expenditures *by the United States for war purposes were much larger after World War I than before, not smaller.* In 1913 the United States spent $244,600,000 for armaments; in 1931, in the middle of our "pacifist" aberration, it spent $727,700,000 for the same purpose. We did scuttle a few battleships, but only after disarming Germany and insisting on naval parity with Great Britain and superiority over all other nations on the basis of the 5-5-3-1½ ratio. With Mr. Roosevelt's accession to office in 1933 our military expenditures began to increase at once, so that as early as 1936 the taxpayer was being assessed $3,000,000 a day for future wars and $5,700,000 for past wars, while he paid a miserly total of $270,000 per day for the Office of Education, the Children's Bureau, Old-Age Pensions, the Employment Service and Maternal and Child Health. The United States never disarmed. It never tried pacifism. It always intended in a show-down to resort to war to defend its "interests" and to maintain the balance of power in favor of itself and its actual or potential allies or satellites.

The people of the United States after World War I desperately *wanted* to believe that they were reducing militarism and might be getting rid of war. What Mr. Byrnes proposes now is that they should not even entertain that wish and hope for a little while. His words recall General Patton telling a roomful of Sunday School children last fall that "We learned that the example of weakness set by the United States did not compel Italy and Japan and Germany to follow suit. . . . This tragic experience makes us realize that weakness invites aggression."

This is the kind of catch-phrase that sounds likes a profound truth, whereas in the present context it is foolish and dangerous talk.

One would suppose that big, armed powers never had any trouble! Instead, the course of history is strewn with the wrecks of such powers. Was it their "weakness" that caused their downfall? Rather, it was their efforts to monopolize resources and dominate other peoples. It was their increasing reliance on military might, which involved them in a cycle of bigger and bigger wars that ended in mutual extinction.

As a matter of fact, Italy, Germany and Japan all were

hopelessly inferior at the close of World War I to the victor nations in that war. (And had Mr. Byrnes been a little more comprehensive and realistic, he would have spoken of Russia, then the most weakened and humiliated of all the leading nations!) That did not stop them from re-arming. The victor nations and their satellites controlled 85 per cent of the earth's key resources, and almost as much of its territory, which they were determined to hold even at the cost of another world war, if that should be necessary. And as Henry Noel Brailsford, the British international relations expert, pointed out, "not all the guns and battleships in creation," not even if they were in the hands of a League of Nations or world government, can keep the peace in the face of such economic monopoly and anarchy!

If military might is the only thing that commands respect for a nation, then all nations will want to have, and should have, an equal amount. Is Mr. Byrnes working for that? Does he think it would be a good idea for every nation to have an equal stockpile of atomic bombs? If not, surely he can see that there are only two other possibilities: a perpetual jockeying for power on the part of all the big nations, relieved only by an occasional precarious and short-lived equilibrium; or abolition of all national military establishments. Only the latter would give equality and confidence.

The Secretary of State has made it clear that when he talks today of the United States' inability to disarm "while other nations remain armed" and of the necessity of building a conscript army to "restrain" offending nations, he is looking at Russia. Looked at realistically—say through Russian eyes——this means that when, despite the UNO, the Soviet Union wants Iranian oil or Manchuria's industrial equipment, the United States must have the power to say No! The United States, that is, is to have the last word because it will have the armies and the atomic bomb to make Russia "behave."

Suppose we do not repeat what Mr. Byrnes calls the mistake of becoming soft and pacifistic and reducing our military establishment. Suppose we continue the draft, adopt peacetime conscription, manufacture atomic bombs, and make Russia back down. That will be a humiliation more keenly felt than what Russia experienced after 1917, by a people who have suffered frightfully in the recent war.

Does Mr. Byrnes really believe that by this means he will win Stalin and Molotov and the Red Army command to sweet reasonableness? Induce them to become friends of capitalism and docile members of UNO. As it was not possible to keep Russia from rising out of the abyss of weakness and misery into which it was plunged after the Revolution, so it is preposterous to think that Russia will now accept second place in or out of UNO! When did a great Power in this kind of situation ever accept inferiority without first demanding a show-down fight? To suppose that the present rulers of Russia would do so is to commit a political blunder of colossal magnitude.

By his words Mr. Byrnes dissociates himself from Churchill's military alliance against Russia. By his deeds Mr. Byrnes challenges Russia on the military plane; he would take another big step in the atomic armament race with the Soviet Union. It is by his deeds that he will be judged—by Stalin today and tomorrow; by history the day after tomorrow. The result will be atomic war, a little sooner or a little later, but inevitably. No amount of talk about doing it all for UNO or peace will alter that.

The last point in this section of Mr. Byrnes' speech is similarly illogical and unrealistic. "It must be acknowledged," says he, "that universal military training involves a major change in our society," but in the next breath assures us that "as for the effect of the training upon the boys, I can see no cause for alarm." They will remain civilians and democrats he rashly assumes, in a nation gearing itself feverishly for atomic war! Here again is the all-too-common assumption that Americans are a unique form of humanity who will remain unaffected by the same form of regimentation that brutalized and militarized whole generations in other countries. One doubts that Mr. Byrnes would be similarly optimistic over the prospects of Soviet youth remaining unaffected by *their* training. But Americans, says he in effect, are a different breed, a *herrenvolk!* They want only peace (having an annual income practically equal to that of all the other United Nations combined!) and their purity of motive is such that God has entrusted to them the atomic bomb, so that they may secure the blessings of peace to all men!

An Open Letter

Dear Mr. Byrnes:

You have the reputation of being a man of good will, a reconciler, one who takes his profession of Christian faith seriously. These things you said on St. Patrick's Day are not worthy of you. Will you not consider that voice which says, "Put up that sword, that atom bomb, into its place"? Will you not perform an act of true statesmanship and propose universal disarmament, so that, the struggle as to which is greatest among them having ceased, the nations may sit down as equals to save the starving children, plan peace and rebuild the ruined world?

A. J. MUSTE

Message to the UNO

"Gentlemen, speak no more to the mothers about your peace and its 'enforcement.' Your peace seems almost more terrible to us than was the war. For beyond the war we saw the rainbow of peace, but beyond your peace we see the lightning flashes heralding the thunders of war. Speak to us, gentlemen, of law; speak to us of Liberty; speak to us of justice; speak to us of humanity; speak to us of truth. . . .

"We would relieve you of your fears, gentlemen. But first you must lay aside your guns. You must come into the room of your mother unarmed. Then we will show you that the healing power in the world is not where you search for it, is not in the earthquake and the fire, but in the still small voice; is not in the instruments of destruction, but in the universal will to creation; is not in the intellect even, but in the emotion of the ideal—the unquenchable faith in life, the indestructible power of love."

DOROTHY THOMPSON in the
Ladies Home Journal, Feb. 1946.

What Does Russia Want?

By VERNON NASH

National Field Work Director, World Federalists, U.S.A. Member FOR National Council

OBVIOUSLY peace workers have been premature in thinking their major task to be the prevention of a third world war. World War II has not ended, either officially or in fact. Little wars here and there, coupled with bitter tensions among the great powers, can produce renewed general conflict at any time. History probably would not call such a struggle a third world war but "World War II—Act 2."

The stagehands whom by some curious perversion of language we call statesmen are placing the "sets" for war whenever they begin habitually to describe the issue in terms of a single option: a choice between supine appeasement or standing firm. Few intelligent persons believe that the nations can reach an understanding by acts that resemble the behavior of schoolboys who draw lines on the playground and dare their opponents to cross. The "get tough" attitude of American political leaders, applauded and abetted by editors and columnists, points down a road that leads straight to war.

It is unlikely that powerful universal revulsion against war will slow the world's progress down that road unless the opposition has precise content. Peacemakers must put forward with irresistible insistence a practicable and plausible third alternative to surrender or fighting. To many, such an additional course of action is fervent support of the UNO, but this suggestion carries less conviction daily as even the most enthusiastic upholders of our latest league of nations speculate on its possible collapse.[1]

The Price of San Francisco

Already we begin to pay the price of having accepted at San Francisco, as "the best we could get," a form of world organization that can function only in the remote event of full unanimity among heavily armed nations that have acute conflicts of interest. No amount of devotion to the UNO can make it work if one or more other great powers refuses to abide by the Charter. One of the commissions at the Columbus meeting of the Federal Council of Churches suggested that an early attempt to alter the nature of UNO would simply produce international anarchy. What in the name of a long-suffering humanity have we got now?

The American people and their leaders, by and large, think they are right in the positions they defend. British leaders and people feel similarly about the course they pursue. Every evidence indicates that the Russians believe as sincerely in the rightness of their cause. All three nations retain the legal authority and the power to do as they please, and to be sole judge of the wisdom and righteousness of their own actions. That is anarchy, pure and unalloyed; its essentially lawless nature is not appreciably changed by a professed willingness to seek understanding and cooperation.

The most ominous phrase of all the terrible harbingers of imminent war is the cry of sincere perplexity, "What else can we do?" It is my fanatical conviction that only one course of action *on the political level* has even the slightest possibility of preventing present hostile acts and moods from eventuating in full-scale war. America can and should say to Russia something like this:

"You have objectives that are in conflict with ours. You are convinced as to the legitimacy of your aims; so are we as to ours. If neither of us will yield, each following his presumed self-interest, then we risk a plunge into another era of mutual destruction and collective suicide. War would bring certain losses to us all that now paralyze the imagination. To prevent such cataclysmic horror, we are prepared to join with you and all other willing peoples in the creation of a common authority with unchallengeable power to control our common concerns, to which we shall all be equally subject."

Would Russia Refuse?

The usual response of Americans to this suggestion is impatient skepticism as to Russia's response, rather than a sober examination of the moral obligation to make such an offer. No one can know with certainty that Russia would refuse it any more than we can be sure that she would accept. What possible harm could it do to find out what her reaction would be to a projected world government? It is my personal judgment (for reasons to be outlined hereafter) that Russia's response would be favorable to a proposal for full world federalism provided the offer were made in good faith and sincerity.

In an address before the UNO Security Council in London on February 10, Russia's chief delegate, Mr. Vishinsky, said: "I would ask whether the United Nations can be an effective organ if national sovereignty is not limited. The nations must sacrifice a part of their sovereignty if the United Nations is to be a real and effective organ." Apparently the Western world is letting that historic remark pass with the same tragic incredulity and indifference with which Litvinoff's reiterated demands for disarmament were received in the sessions of the Geneva league.

In the period between the first and second world wars Russia's need to get out from under the crushing burden of military preparedness was far greater than that of any other nation. She had to create armaments out of her very life-blood, while Britain and the United States could draw on the surplus "fat" of their respective economic orders. Whatever changes in relative status have occurred in this respect, it is plain that the devastating effects of enforced military preparedness upon Russian standards of living have been multiplied many times over by the necessity for reconstruction of her war-torn areas. Normal civilian demands have been denied to a dangerous degree for many years. This one factor alone is sufficiently serious to make the odds good that the Soviet Union would meet us half way in development of a dependable system of collective security that would require and justify disarmament down to domestic policing levels.

When one considers the available evidence concerning the inherent *weakness* of the Soviet Union, how shall one

[1] See, for example, the lead editorial of the *New York Times*, Mar. 9, 1946, commenting upon Churchill's appeal for an Anglo-American alliance.

explain the almost universal assumption that she is a fearful colossus? I have an abiding skepticism about the existence of any widespread "conspiracy"; moreover, many of those who consider the USSR to be a military behemoth have no ulterior motive for playing on our fears. Even those who repudiate vigorously any ideas of a holy war against alleged enemies of freedom and free enterprise still share the illusion that Russia is the goliath of our age. Hence I can only conclude that we are the victims of a hypnosis produced by our own fears. Let us examine critically the considerations upon which these illusions about Russia's preponderant power are based.

Soviet Military Might

The Soviet armies stopped the mightiest military machine the world ever has seen. Logistics (time schedules of supply affected by Germany's having to operate across vast spaces) worked powerfully in Russia's favor. It does not modify the judgment of experts as to the military magnificence of her achievement, moreover, to note that it was not accomplished by her own strength alone. Nevertheless, estimates of Russia's relative strength must be qualified decidedly by the observation that the vital assistance she got from abroad came from the very nations that now threaten to thwart her will. She got 35 per cent of all our Lend-Lease, plus a stupendous supply of materiel from Britain. Edgar Snow, an associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* and perhaps the most widely accepted Western authority on Russia at present, documented in the columns of that magazine his reasons for believing that aid from abroad constituted at least one-fourth of Russia's entire strength in World War II. Even then, she was able merely to maintain a holding line along the Volga and at the Leningrad-Moscow front until the pounding of German cities by the R.A.F. and our Eighth Air Force compelled the German High Command to take the air cover off the Wehrmacht by recalling the Luftwaffe to an attempted defense of their homeland.

When war between Russia and an Anglo-American combination is considered, then the relative significance of these contributions to her in World War II are doubled, since Britain and America can produce these supplies and add them to their own war strength, whereas Russia cannot procure elsewhere any equivalent of them. The now universally accepted axiom that ultimate military strength in modern war depends upon manufacturing potential directs attention to the fact that an earth-scorching war, leaving everything in rubble, was fought twice over a vital area of the USSR—from her Western borders to the Volga and back again.

In an earlier series of articles in the *Post,* Edgar Snow developed the proposition that such warfare leaves Russia in the condition we would be in if such ruin stretched from the Alleghenies to the Rockies with every city and town, north and south, from Pittsburgh to Denver, a heap of rubble. Anyone who can imagine the shape America would be in today if such a calamity had come upon us will know what a fearful and uncertain future Russia faces. This undoubtedly offers the best explanation for her stripping of factories in Manchuria and Eastern Europe.

But the situation for Russia is far worse than the foregoing statements alone would indicate. If all the manufacturing potential of a dozen Midwestern cities were temporarily lost to us, we would at least have in other parts of the country a substantial supply of the tools and dies by which new machinery is made. Russia is crucially deficient in the machines by which other machines are made. She lacks experience and skill in the making of such tools and, in any event, their production in quantity is a very slow process.

Full contemplation of all these facts, leaving the atom bomb out of the account, may give a better understanding of why Russia acts as she does. Those most favorably disposed to the Soviet Union find themselves baffled at times by her policies. If these reflect a sense of overwhelming power and a resultant intention to have her own way, without regard to the consequences, then the outlook is grim, to put it mildly. The prospect changes sharply, however, if it should be true, as I believe it is, that Russia's behavior in recent years arises from the jittery panic of extreme fear. Troops of the allied countries occupied parts of her country in considerable strength only a quarter century ago. It could happen again. The attitude of powerful groups in both Britain and the United States now are scarcely designed to be reassuring.

Russia Knows Her Weakness

Russian leaders know exactly how weak she is, with a far greater degree of precision and clarity than we can have by deduction from such facts as are available to us. Hence they bluster, and they scurry around seeking for security where it is no longer to be found, in the creation of "friendly" buffer states. How much have the Western powers done to allay their fears? Little or nothing. We are equally fearful. Both of us are proving again the validity of Woodrow Wilson's observation that fear is a very poor counsellor.

However good some of America's words may be, her acts reveal that we live still in the bloody old world of absolute nationalisms as though no signatures ever had been affixed to an Atlantic Charter or to the promissory covenant of the UNO. The British manifest every intention of continuing to hold the strategically vital Mediterranean as an English lake. America complains privately and publicly at Russian acts on Russia's very borders, while it insists at the same time that American security requires possession of bases on the other side of the greatest ocean on earth, with the consequent conversion of the Pacific into an American lake!

American officials profess profound devotion to peace while demanding universal military training. Even if one should accept as fully legitimate and workable the type of alleged peace maintenance provided for in the UNO Charter, it is utterly fantastic to assume that obligations to be undertaken by us under the auspices of the Security Council ever could require our entire manpower of effective military age. The veto provision makes it certain that all heavily armed states would be with us, not against us, if the Security Council ever is able to request our aid. Consequently, a mere token force would suffice.

No more tangible proof could be given of the nations' lack of faith in the world organization they have created than the determination of all to remain as heavily armed as possible. President Truman early in March called for additions to the greatest navy on earth, costing an amount in excess of the much-debated British loan. A world of power politics, in which might confers right, has not been

ended by the creation of the UNO. Indeed, power politics is accepted, sanctioned and institutionalized in the most vital clauses of its Charter.

In consequence, every great power continues to seek its own self-interest, always preeminently and often exclusively. The normal pattern of behavior is being recapitulated with all the inexorable horror of a classic Greek tragedy. Virtually everyone places upon others blame for the anarchic chaos which inevitably results from unilateral action. It does not seem even to occur to the supposedly wise and great of any powerful nation's governing personnel that his own country might be gravely at fault. No nation yet is willing to set the good example of seeking realistically the benefits for all that can come only from placing the general welfare of all above the presumed self-interest of any one country. It was a central intuition of Jesus that the only valid selfishness is an enlightened altruism. The man who seeks to save his life is the one who loses it.

Sam Jones, famous Southern evangelist of another day, once described one of the denominations of his region as merely "the religious work department of the Democratic Party." Now that the Federal Council has let itself become a moralistic echo of the State Department, our people wander as sheep without a shepherd, political or religious. We drift in hypnotized terror toward a war that no one wants, and from which no one could possibly gain anything.

That nightmare trance will not be broken by adjurations for bold, courageous faith that are coupled with support of obviously inadequate concrete measures. The dragon whose fiery, bloodshot eyes frighten us into immobility can be slain only by a proposal so radical and thoroughgoing as to produce a new mood and a new atmosphere throughout the earth. America's failure to act promptly in such a way at a time like this will be nothing less than an international crime of the first magnitude.

Marcus Aurelius anticipated the confession from the Book of Common Prayer by many centuries when he wrote: "A wrongdoer is often a man that has left something undone, not always he that has done something." It is notable that the severest condemnations of Jesus fell upon persons for what they had failed to do rather than for what they had done.

The Way to Peace with Russia

A STATEMENT BY THE F.O.R. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MARCH 12, 1946

RECENT developments have emphasized sharply the tension in the relations of the United States and Great Britain with Soviet Russia. The calls by Senator Vandenberg and Secretary Byrnes for a "get tough" attitude, Churchill's open advocacy of an Anglo-American political and military alliance, and Stalin's prompt retort describing this as a doctrine of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority and a virtual declaration of war on Russia, make it clear that the gravity of the situation hardly can be overestimated.

Our basic political position is one of total opposition to war between the United States and Russia, to measures of war preparation, and to any steps that might lead to such conflict. War between the United States and Russia would be global and atomic, and would constitute an indescribable calamity for all mankind. As religious pacifists we are opposed to war in principle, but it is our conviction that on no grounds whatever is there any excuse for such a war.

It is essential that Americans cultivate a calm spirit and an objective mind, and avoid being stampeded emotionally by lurid press reports, speeches and rumors. Distinction must be made between the Russian people and the Russian government, as in certain situations we would wish a distinction to be made between the people and the government of the United States. The positive contributions of Russia and its people must be remembered and appreciated, and words or actions avoided that are calculated to irritate and offend a sensitive people who have passed through decades of humiliation and suffering.

We do not imply that Russian policies and acts should be immune from criticism. There are certain fundamental differences between the Jewish-Christian, democratic way of life, and the Communist—or Stalinist—system. These differences must be faced. Genuine reconciliation must be built on truth, and must grow out of a facing of issues, not out of an attempt to evade them. We deplore a tendency in some quarters to welcome criticism of the western democracies and their leadership and culture, but to reject as "fascist" or "isolationist" any criticism of Russia, Stalin or Communism. But we deplore equally all forms of "Red-baiting," including the disposition of some persons to discredit any proposal, person or group with which they do not agree, by labelling it "Communist." We shall defend freedom of speech, press, and assemblage for Communists as well as others.

Russian sympathizers, however, must face the fact that the presence in one country of persons and groups that follow almost automatically the policies of another government, shifting position overnight on important issues in accord with such policies, is a serious obstacle to the working out of friendly and frank relationships. The same observation applies to the familiar Communist tactic of infiltrating into labor, farm, civic, educational and church groups while hiding and denying the political identity of those engaged in this procedure, and of organizing "front" organizations while concealing the decisive or dominant political control of such organizations. Religious pacifists maintain faith in and desire fellowship with all men whatever their allegiance and beliefs, but true fellowship must be built on straightforwardness and truth. We deem it confusing, unwise, and harmful to our cause to engage in organizational collaboration with movements which one day oppose American participation in war and the next favor it; or which before V-E Day vigorously urge peacetime conscription for America, and as vigorously oppose it after, though still defending such conscription on the part

of the Soviet Union. Both instances, of course, refer to the recent course of the Communist Party in the United States.

The issues at stake between this country and Russia are grouped around two principal points. One has to do with the policies and acts of these nation-states; the other with their philosophies of life and the universe. In both fields the issues are complicated and profound and on either side information about conditions and developments on the other side is very inadequate. We plead earnestly, therefore, that all concerned make every effort to discover and publicize relevant information and to engage in constant and careful study of the issues.

However, the immediate crisis is so acute that we feel bound to make a provisional statement of our views on certain aspects of the problem, which we trust may be helpful to our own membership and perhaps to others.

I. Power Politics

It seems obvious that the Russian government is carrying out an expansionist policy that includes making disposition involving the fate of nations and peoples without consultation with these peoples or with its allies. On occasion its policies result in bitter hardship and cruelty, as in the case of the millions of Germans driven out of former German territory or regions under Russian occupation. In these situations the Soviet Union is behaving as a nation-State that has refused to surrender its "sovereignty" and is devoted to the pursuit of its own "interests" and "security," believing that these can be achieved only by the possession and use—or threat—of military might.

Unfortunately, post-war statesmanship generally has accepted the thesis that international order can be established only on the basis of an alliance of just such nation-states. If it is now once again demonstrated that no true peace can be built on such an alliance, the blame cannot be placed on Russia alone. Nations that insisted equally on retaining their own sovereignty and depending on their military might for "security" are in no position to condemn the USSR.

The United States itself is practicing power politics in building a stockpile of atomic bombs and in insisting on virtually unilateral control in Japan and strategic bases in the Pacific. Secretary Byrnes' important policy pronouncement on February 28, 1946, emphasized this in a disquieting and ominous way. The basis of the whole statement was the argument that, though they might be subject to some change, very gradually and by mutual agreement, "the present power relationships of the great states" constitute the foundation for peace . . . Those power relationships cannot be fundamentally altered "without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations." He insisted on the maintenance of a powerful military establishment by the United States and on universal military training. Finally, he emphasized certain "special United States interests," which can be read "spheres of influence."

Thus once again in history two vast power-entities confront each other. Unless the pattern under which they operate is changed fundamentally a titanic conflict is inevitable. Temporary "appeasement" of one nation by the other will not avert this, but is simply one more of the dynamic, ever-shifting power-relationships that constitute in themselves a virtual state of war. As pacifists we place no more faith in "appeasement" of Russia than of Germany, France, the United States or any other nation. On the other hand, the attempt to achieve "collective security" against a power-state such as Russia or the United States is equally fatuous, for it would mean simply an attempt to "gang up" against one of them that would certainly instigate a counter-alliance. An ever-accelerated armament race also is part of this process. Each nation extends its territory of influence in order to achieve "security," but the very effort makes the other feel less secure, and hence more "aggressive."

This vicious circle must be broken, and the primary responsibility for breaking it rests with the United States. Its resources are greater; it has suffered less in the war; it can better afford to risk something for the sake of peace. Americans can more reasonably be expected to be in a mood to think calmly and act wisely.

The United States has not had Russia's experience of having been isolated, surrounded, and treated as a pariah among the nations. Under such circumstances it is hardly surprising to find hostility and suspicion, a "persecution complex," and even a desire for retaliation. Americans ought to be willing to take the initiative in removing the conditions that generate such attitudes.

Western Imperialism Started It

Western imperialism, including American, has set the example of power politics and militarism. Russia, like Japan, is a comparative latecomer. The Western democracies have, therefore, a responsibility to set a different example now. Certainly they cannot complain if, failing to do that, they are compelled to drink the medicine they have administered and would administer to others.

American professions of democracy and Christianity are lofty, and Americans often feel impelled to lecture other peoples for their shortcomings at these points. Now it is necessary to abandon such professions or really live up to them, and to do the latter means to take the initiative in creating a new international atmosphere.

The development and use of the atomic bomb, and the unilateral building of a stockpile of bombs, have increased immeasurably this responsibility. No other single factor contributes so much to the almost unbearable tension of international relations as the bomb. America's security has been utterly washed out unless it now moves to bring security to the entire world. How shall that be done?

1. The United States should cease the manufacture of atomic weapons, and share with all peoples the secrets of atomic energy and its development for productive purposes.

2. This country should propose immediate drastic reduction of armament and abolition of conscription by international agreement, looking toward complete abolition of national military establishments in the very near future. This would mean that nations actually would abolish the war system, which is the only possible guarantee that use of the bomb will be abolished. Russia made proposals for disarmament and abolition of conscription in 1927 and again later. It is America's turn to advance this eminently sound proposal—and to make it stick.

3. The present United Nations set-up and old concepts of national sovereignty have been rendered obsolete by the atomic bomb. To establish international control of atomic energy, to abolish conscription and to eliminate national military establishments, mean in effect that nations do sur-

render a measure of sovereignty in the ordinary sense of that term. Consequently, the UNO should at once convene a world conference to put the above proposals into effect and actually to begin setting up the world government that will be needed in this new era. We cannot live politically in the seventeenth century and scientifically in the fiftieth.

II. Democracy vs. Dictatorship

President Roosevelt said, on February 11, 1940, when Russia was in alliance with Germany and attacking Finland: "The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, as everybody knows who has the courage to face the facts, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world." We do not believe that this situation has altered radically. Nor do we doubt that the life-view of the Communist (Stalinist) leadership is essentially secular and materialistic.

But again Americans must consider their own position. Some remnants of democracy and Christian insight and conviction still remain, and they should not be underestimated. But this democracy is largely formal, and confined to the political sphere. Men are not economically free. The profession of belief in the infinite worth of each human being is belied by the multitudes who are made mere cogs in an industrial machine. America practices racism and imperialism. The State it tends to become more absolute; it relies habitually on force. The nation's ethics have become relativistic. A resort to the most atrocious methods of wholesale slaughter of non-combatants in war brought no effective protest, even from the churches.

As we pointed out in an earlier section, power politics played by Russia stimulates Anglo-American power politics, and vice versa. They are two sides of the same coin, complementary aspects of the political anarchy and disintegration of our time. Similarly, the theoretical atheism of the Soviet leaders and the practical atheism of so-called Christian countries and their leaders, the psuedo-socialism of Russia and the psuedo-democracy of the Western peoples are two sides of one coin, complementary aspects of the moral and religious disintegration of our era.

Combatting Dictatorship

The inadequate and evil in Soviet ideology can be fought successfully only by spiritual weapons and on condition that its opponents remove first the beams from their own eyes. We advocate therefore:

1. That the government of the United States and its people strive vigorously to show the world an example of a genuine working democracy. This would involve renunciation of practices that limit political democracy, such as the poll-tax; the elimination of racist attitudes and practices; and provision of economic security for all out of the resources with which God has endowed this nation.

2. That the United States should bend every effort to achieve a speedy end to white imperialism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

3. That this country withdraw support from reactionary, exploiting elements in countries where American troops are located, or where it exerts influence by other means, and that it encourage instead democratic forces in those areas. This would mean abandonment of efforts to impose democracy by foreign occupation, and the speediest possible establishment of peace and world order in which all nations and peoples may share on a basis of self-respect and cooperation.

4. That the American government and people engage in a great, self-sacrificing effort of immediate relief for the desperately needy of the earth, and work out a large-scale World Reconstruction Program that would set in motion everywhere the stalled processes of economic life. The United States should back such a program with sums of money bearing a reasonable relation to the vast amounts spent during the war, which might be raised by "Humanity Loans" or in such other ways as study may suggest. At the same time the government should abandon at once all policies that result in the economic strangulation of conquered peoples, in favor of a policy of rebuilding the world community as a united whole.

5. That having set an example by offering to share with all peoples, we call on all governments to remove the barriers to free entry and exit of reporters, students, and visitors in order that the peoples of the world may come to know each other and thus dissipate the suspicions, prejudices and fears that are so largely derived from ignorance.

The question multitudes ask is whether Russia would respond favorably to such proposals and whether we could trust it to carry them out honestly. The first reply to such a question is that no one has the right to ask whether the Russians would accept until the proposal has been made. Raising the question before Americans have made up their own minds to try this course is simply a means of evading responsibility.

Russia Needs Peace

In the second place, the Russian people have suffered tragically. They desperately need peace. It is inconceivable that they would reject an honest offer of peace. We see no reason to assume that the Russian people are a peculiar breed, essentially different from other peoples. It is almost equally difficult to believe that the Soviet government would reject genuine peace proposals. If that regime is enamoured of power and dictatorial in character, it is at the same time realistic, and is hardly likely to believe that it can retain control over the Russian people if it rejects an attainable peace.

In any case, maintaining the pattern of power politics and continuing the present atomic armament race can only strengthen and intensify the Soviet dictatorship and foster totalitarianism in the United States and the rest of the world. The one way to undermine dictatorship and establish democracy is to create the conditions of peace and well-being in which democracy can flourish.

Whatever the execution of such a program might cost it would be trivial compared to the cost of atomic war. It would bring us the security that no armies or navies or stockpiles of atomic bombs can afford. The nation that took the initiative in such a program would assume the moral leadership of the world.

In this moment of crisis, apprehension and anguish we remind ourselves of our basic faith that the way to overcome evil is by doing good. We pray that we may become more faithful and effective ministers of the healing and reconciliation that God would bring to the nations.

These Are the Work-Strikers

By ERNEST ALLYN SMITH*

WORK-STRIKERS[1] in prison have been acclaimed and condemned in print and conversation from the early days of the war, when an occasional man would refuse to work, right up to the present time when significant proportions of the CO prison population are striking for one reason or another. The Danbury Federal Correctional Institution today has eighteen work-strikers segregated in a cell block called "Upper Hartford."

Rarely has a man who has participated in one of these actions attempted to explain the motivation of the strikers and to evaluate the effects of their action. My own analysis is the result of two and one-half years of intimate association with a wide variety of work-strikers in Danbury, totalling about forty men.

Refuse to Be "Pushed Around"

Some men enter prison with a full set of principles that causes them to refuse to work. This basic opposition to conscription, regimentation, and totalitarianism, has provided many of the most dramatic examples of non-cooperation in prison. Nevertheless, these men are the exceptions. Most of the strikers I know refused to work because of actual experience with prison totalitarianism and injustice, and not because of some "inner light" conviction.

They are not the product of educational programs, philosophical systems, or religious beliefs. They are men who are temperamentally and emotionally opposed to being "pushed around." They are strong individuals with imagination and initiative, willing to act alone, if necessary. Usually they have strong convictions about individual freedom, economic and political democracy, and racial equality. In prison they face Jim Crow, censorship, punitive mistreatment, parole discriminations, and total regimentation. Most men first oppose the prison system because of a single example of concrete injustice. When a man has once engaged in a single action, and has experienced isolation or segregation, it is easier for him to refuse to work in the future. He knows how much he can "take," and he loses his fears of what the officials can do to him.

Rigorous punishment of work-strikers usually is of limited duration, and rarely more than thirty days. After that time, prison officials realize that the man is unwavering, and relax restrictions, permitting correspondence, books, and writing materials. If a work-striker is alone, unsupported by fellow prisoners, improved conditions come slowly, but if he is part of a united group, the changes occur more quickly. Prison officials with experience in dealing with determined work-strikers usually prefer to avoid the "sand" that COs can throw into their smooth-running machine.

When men are locked up in close quarters for years on end, it is imperative that they have privacy, freedom from petty regimentation, books, and materials for writing, painting, and study. The prison does not *give* these things to work-strikers; they have to be fought for.

Work-strikers in Danbury act constantly to get better food, adequate yard periods and living quarters, books and periodicals. Tolerable conditions were won in December, 1943, after a brief hunger strike, and during the next two years there was a gradual improvement. The men eat unregimented; cleaning is unassigned and voluntary. Men get up and eat when they choose; they read, study, think, sleep, in privacy, and join bull sessions as they please. No regimentation is allowed in Upper Hartford. Elsewhere, regimentation and routine go on unimpeded, but they make a detour at the door of the work-striker. Every aspect of the situation that exists there is the result of the strikers' actions, planned or spontaneous, by the whole or by individuals.

The Danbury work-strikers were strongly united during the four and one-half month Jim-Crow strike in 1943. They learned that they must stick together and act together, or be weak. Other men joining the work-strike learned the same lesson.

Strikers Free to Act

Prison control is maintained by threatening prisoners with loss of privilege, loss of parole, and loss of "good time." The work-strikers, however, are not concerned with loss of privileges. They fought to get them, and they can fight to maintain them. They will not take discriminatory CO paroles, and even the threat of loss of "good time" does not prevent them from taking action. On the contrary, it frees them for action to improve conditions in the prison, and to oppose punitive mistreatment of other prisoners.

Immediate action released a man thrown into the "bing" for not going to work, although he was ill. It got another CO out of the "bing" because he went on a work-strike. The strikers join action for better food, better conditions, and for freedom. On Christmas Day, signs were plastered all over the prison yard demanding freedom for all political prisoners. The action received strong approval from the whole prison population.

The strikers find their unregimented life more personally satisfying. A prison job and prison routine take up most of a prisoner's time and energy. Why should a man spend years at a boring job when his own interests demand something entirely different? He may want to write a book, short stories, or poetry. He may want to paint or sketch. He may want to follow a personal course of study. He may want and need ample time for discussion with other men. The only men who have time to do these things are the men who refuse to work and to be regimented. Often the potential advantages are sufficient to encourage a man to go on a work-strike.

The full story is yet to be told of the continuous fight of the work-strikers in prison. Few people know of the concrete effects of the strikers' opposition to regimentation and injustice. Few have bothered to evaluate the significant changes in prison practice brought about through the struggle of these men. When the story is told, it will prove the effectiveness of the work-strike, and it will show the real contribution made by the continuous struggle for increased freedom and justice.

* Instructor in Political Science, Lincoln University.

1 "Work-strikers" means those men who consistently refuse to cooperate with the prison work program.

Theologians Declare U. S. Bombing Morally Indefensible

Both the atomic bombing of two Japanese cities and the policy of "wholesale obliteration bombing" of other cities in both Japan and Germany were morally indefensible and call for deep penitence on the part of American Christians. That was the substance of a startling report made to the Federal Council of Churches meeting in Columbus, Ohio, last month by twenty-two theologians constituting the "Commission on the Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith." Only seven of the Commission members are pacifists.

Describing the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as "repeating the indiscriminate slaughter of non-combatants that has become familiar" during the war, the statement reviewed the circumstances surrounding the two bombings, pointing out the "already hopeless" strategic position of Japan, the failure of the American government to give any warning of the new weapon, and its refusal to give a "prior demonstration" of the missile's destructiveness. In the light of such "irresponsible" acts, the Commission judged the bombings morally indefensible, "whatever be one's judgment of the ethics of war in principle."

Saturation Bombing

The Commission pointed out, however, that the atomic bombings could not be isolated from the "whole system of obliteration attacks," and referred specifically to the "horrors of the incendiary raids on Tokyo, and of the saturation bombings of Hamburg, Dresden, and Berlin." Protests against these, it recalled, had been met by the plea of "military necessity," although the eventual report of Air Force investigators "had now admitted the military ineffectiveness of much of the planned destruction."

Admitting the "grievous provocation" under which Allied leaders adopted the policy, the statement added: "But we have never agreed that a policy affecting the present well-being of millions of non-combatants and the future relationships of whole peoples should be decided finally on military grounds, and we believe the right to criticize military policies on ethical grounds is freshly justified by the proved fallibility of competent professional soldiers in dealing with such problems in this war."

[The policy of obliteration bombing got its most vehement opposition in this country through the February and March, 1944, issues of *Fellowship*, in the latter of which twenty-eight prominent religious leaders joined Vera Brittain's impassioned plea in "Massacre by Bombing." Miss Brittain at that time challenged the assertion of "military necessity" under which the bombing was justified, for which she was widely criticized for "presuming" to question the judgment of Allied military leaders.]

Conscription Up Again

Although anti-conscription workers a few weeks ago felt that peacetime conscription and extension of the Selective Service Act were practically defeated, growing tension between the United States and Russia, aggravated by this government's "get-tough" policy, has brought both measures a dangerous amount of new support. Peace workers sent out a hurry call late in March, urging all opponents of conscription to write or wire their Representatives and Senators at once.

Testimony of Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge condemning compulsory military training, the whole war system and the fascist nature of the Army itself was given front-page space by a number of leading dailies, the *Washington Daily News* carrying the story under a page-wide headline "West Point Man Bites Dog." General Holdridge, a graduate of West Point with thirty years of Army service, was honorably retired in February 1944. Speaking both for himself and for the Veterans League of America, General Holdridge said in testifying:

"After studying the problem and after listening to the representatives of the War Department, I am depressed and appalled that the Army seems to have learned little during the past thirty years. I am unable to find a single argument presented by the War Department in favor of compulsory military training that will stand up under close scrutiny. . . .

"The development of the atomic bomb constitutes a revolution in military science more sweeping than the invention of gunpowder," the General declared. "The Army has looked in the back of the book, put its finger on the same old answer 'compulsory military training' and is trying to work the problem backward . . . Before any of the basic factors of the problem have been determined it demands that Congress and the people of the country sign a blank check, to be filled in at its own discretion, and to any amount, down to the last American boy. Why is it in such a hurry? . . . We can only conclude that the Army is trying to railroad this legislation through on a wave of post-war hysteria."

Amnesty Demonstration

The Committee for Amnesty for All Objectors to War and Conscription has issued a call to friends and relatives of CO's imprisoned during World War II, and to ex-cons themselves, to take part in a demonstration planned to take place in Washington, D. C., on May 11.

Albon Man, Secretary of the Committee, announced that demonstrators will march to the White House where selected spokesmen will present the case for amnesty, after which smaller groups will visit congressmen. Mr. Man said that plans are being made for overnight sleeping facilities, particularly for those demonstrators having children or coming from a long distance. He urged all who can join in the demonstration to write the Amnesty Committee, Room 1029, 5 Beekman St., New York 7, N. Y. Participants are asked to state whether the trip will be made by train, bus or car, and if by car whether they can accommodate other persons from the same area.

The Secretary pointed out that the demonstration provides an opportunity for families and relatives of men in prison to make an effective protest against continued confinement of conscientious objectors now that the war is over. He called attention to the success of the "Children's Crusade" organized twenty-three years ago by Mrs. Kate Richards O'Hare to campaign for the release of their fathers after World War I.

Anti-war Constitution

Chapter 2, Article IX of Japan's proposed new Constitution says: "War, as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force is forever renounced as a means of settling disputes with other nations. The maintenance of land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential will never be authorized. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized." Thus the Japanese people have set a new standard built upon faith in the justice, tolerance and understanding of mankind.

Takao Saito, leader of the Progressive party in Japan, has given his wholehearted approval to the draft of the new Constitution, at the same time making the following observation: "Actual renunciation of war is unfair unless there is a 'guarantee' that the Japanese never will be menaced by a foreign nation. Therefore it is desirable," he declared "that similar provisions be inserted in the constitutions of other countries."

A significant step has also been taken by the French, whose new Constitution gives the Government the right to surrender the necessary degree of sovereignty whenever a world government is actually set up.

U. S. Occupation Policy Sure to Cause Mass Starvation in Germany and Japan

Experiments at the University of Minnesota with thirty-six CO volunteer guinea pigs reveal that at least a year will be required to restore starving populations to normal health, Dr. Ancil Keys, director of the experiment, told a clinical conference of the Chicago Medical Society last month. Dr. Keys, speaking of the results of starvation, said "even their hearts shrank in size" on a low protein diet averaging 1,700 calories a day, and the men lost 40 per cent of their body weight in six months. He stated further that a high protein diet of 2,700 to 3,600 calories had brought them only half way toward recovery in six months of rehabilitative treatment.

A few days after Dr. Keys' statement appeared in the press, the New York *Herald Tribune* announced that the American Military Government might cut substantially the food ration in their zone of Germany according to a senior officer. The action would depend, the officer allegedly said, on "an expected decision at Washington fixing exports to western Germany for the period until next summer's harvest." The threatened cut would place the daily ration at something below the 1,550 calories promised by the American Military Government, a level already considerably below the starvation ration used in the CO experiments. At the end of February the British announced that they were forced to cut the ration in their zone to 1,014 calories, and the French have put theirs down to 1,075. These and the threatened American cut will mean that people living in the three zones of western Germany will be forced closer to the point of death by starvation than those living in the eastern section.

Writing for the International Rescue and Relief Committee, Chairman L. Hollingsworth Wood declared that our continued starving of Germany to death could have only one result, ultimate war. "Germany was starving when it turned to Nazism in the thirties," he said. "Germany is starving today. And hunger doesn't build democracy."

Worse in Japan

Developments in Japan indicated that the food situation there will soon be worse, if anything, than in Germany. Burton Crane, in a dispatch to the New York *Times,* reports that the Combined Food Board's decision to grant Japan only 600,000 tons of food means that starvation conditions are certain to arise. The amount in question is less than one-fifth of what General MacArthur requested, and about half the "absolute minimum figure" sent to Washington.

Headquaters officials, reports Mr. Crane, are arranging to have the scanty stocks sent to the cities where American troops are stationed, "the idea apparently being to prevent absolute starvation where food riots are likely to disturb Americans, and let the Japanese elsewhere starve quietly, bothering only their own authorities."

ACLU Asks Pacifist Citizenship Eligibility

In a brief urging the U. S. Supreme Court "to declare pacifists eligible for naturalization as American citizens," the American Civil Liberties Union has supported the appeal of James Louis Girouard, Canadian Seventh Day Adventist. The Court was reminded that freedom from discrimination on religious grounds is an American tradition and that such freedom is violated by excluding religious pacifists from citizenship.

The question of Mr. Girouard's eligibility revolves around the "support and defend" oath required of prospective citizens, and the interpretation put upon that clause fifteen years ago when the Court ruled that Congress intended the oath to mean "a willingness to bear arms." The ACLU has now urged the Supreme Court to reverse its earlier decision on the ground that substantially the same oath has been used freely with prospective lawyers, civil service employees, public officials, and army non-combatants having conscientious scruples against war and the bearing of firearms.

Sayre Visits Germany

Recent letters from Nevin Sayre have told of his travels through England, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Writing about his nine days in Germany, Mr. Sayre said: "I managed by various devices to visit Frankfurt, Kassel, Arolsen, Hanover, Petzen, the Ruhr area, Cologne and Aachen, and saw Wilhelm Mensching and a number of our leading people. They have come through the ordeal of the last thirteen years wonderfully well. Mensching says there are at least two hundred pacifists, members or friends of FOR, in Germany today.

Mr. Sayre went on to say that Hanover was so thoroughly destroyed by bombing that when he arrived at the railroad station after an all-night ride standing up or sitting on his suitcase, there was no waiting-room to sit in, no hotel to go to, no spot to rest until he found a seat in a Post Office.

Following the International FOR Council meeting in Stockholm March 24-31 he expected to return to England via Scotland and Ireland, arriving in New York by plane on April 14.

Youths Want Atomic Energy Used for Peace

Prompted by a conviction that atomic energy must be dedicated to peace, sons and daughters of those who worked on the atomic bomb in Oak Ridge, Tenn., have set up the Youth Council on the Atomic Crisis. The fourfold purpose of the Council is stated in the constitution: to learn the facts about atomic energy and its social implication; to promote discussion of the facts among relatives and associates; to influence responsible men to prevent destructive use of atomic energy; and to work for the dedication of atomic energy to peace.

The Oak Ridge Youth Council has issued a call to other high school and college groups to join in their effort "to help bring the meaning of atomic energy home to the minds of our fellow men" by forming councils in their schools. Members of the YCAC publish *The Oak Leaf* which carries illustrations, informational material and editorials pertinent to the Council's stated purpose. The Youth Council collaborated in the preparation of the new Forerunners pamphlet *Calling All Congressmen.*

Amnesty for All but CO's

The Friends Committee on National Legislation, one of the groups seeking amnesty for imprisoned CO's, pointed out recently that amnesty has been granted to political prisoners in Greece, Spain, Brazil, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and India; that General MacArthur has ordered the release of political prisoners of the last fifteen years in Japan; that President Truman gave a Christmas Eve amnesty to men with criminal records who had entered the armed forces after July 29, 1941 and who had meritorious records of military service. The President did not include amnesty for conscientious objectors although he had been urged to do so by the Veterans League of America, the Socialist Party of New Jersey, as well as many church and peace organizations.

Correction

The name of Rufus Jones was erroneously included last month in the list of newly elected members of the FOR National Council. Rufus D. Bowman's name should be added to the list of those co-opted to the Council.

Hall on Federal Council

The Federal Council of Churches has announced election of the Rev. Cameron P. Hall to the staff of the Department of Christian Social Relations, to serve with the Rev. James Myers as Co-Secretary of the Industrial Relations Division and the Committee on the Church and Cooperatives. Mr. Hall goes to the Federal Council position after serving as director of the Department of Social Education and Action of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and from an extensive background in the fields of labor relations and religion. Both Mr. Myers and Mr. Hall are members of the FOR.

World Council Asks Peace

"War is the result of human self-will and of men's tragic inability to find the true solution of their conflicts," declared the World Council of Churches meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, February 21-23. "We pray God that the United Nations will choose the way of life," the churchmen's message continued, "and save future generations from the scourge of war. But the time is short. Man's triumph in the release of atomic energy threatens his destruction. Unless men's whole outlook is changed, our civilization will perish." The Council appealed to "all men of good will and all who believe in spiritual values and forces to work together for an order of justice and humanity."

Fall FOR Conference

Fellowship members were urged to start making arrangements now for their attendance at the Fall Conference of the FOR, by the representative committee that is making plans for it. No details of the program have been released yet, but the committee promises that it will be strong enough to match the challenge of these days. The Conference will be held on the weekend following Labor Day, at some point in Ohio. Donald Harrington is chairman of the committee in charge.

Council Aids Minorities

So many Californians have become increasingly conscious of their responsibility for promoting right attitudes toward minorities that a State Council for Civic Unity has been set up to coordinate the work of organizations in approximately 125 towns and cities. The Council's governing board includes Japanese, Negroes and Caucasians; Jews, Catholics and Protestants; educators, professional men and labor leaders; left-wing liberals and reactionaries.

Jottings

In a current issue of *Worldover Press* Devere Allen suggests that persons expressing prejudice against Jews for alleged "acquisitiveness" be told about the Hebrew Free Loan Society which lends money, without interest, to Jews and Gentiles alike. The Loan Society operates in various cities throughout the United States and last year gave help amounting to more than a million dollars to persons in temporary need. In fifty years the Society has helped more than 650,000 persons of all races and creeds, with a loss of less than one-half of one per cent.

* * *

Ernest Lefever, serving under the war prisoners program of the YMCA and the Brethren Service Committee, wrote that he expected to attend the International FOR Council Meeting in Stockholm last month, traveling with the English delegation by boat via Denmark. Following the Council meeting he planned to remain in Sweden to visit relatives of a POW in the camp he serves, after which he will fly to Brussels to accompany Rev. Rufus Bucher, moderator of the Brethren Annual Conference, on a trip through Holland and the British Zone of Germany.

* * *

The first national conference of the Catholic Association for International Peace since the war will be held at Hartford, Conn., April 22-23, Dr. George N. Shuster, president, has announced. Among the subjects to be discussed are atomic energy control and disarmament, the Church and reconstruction, the UNO and special problems within its scope, and peace treaties.

* * *

Roy A. Burkhart has prepared a pamphlet, *The Church and Returning Conscientious Objectors,* as a companion piece to the pamphlet dealing with the Church's responsibility to the returning soldier. The new pamphlet is being distributed by the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10, at ten cents each.

* * *

Pastor Martin Niemoeller, outstanding religious leader and heroic resister of Nazism, spoke to the American people for the first time since the war when he appeared on the March ninth program of "Religion in the News." Pastor Niemoeller declared that no peace built upon vengeance can survive and no peace will last that does not provide for the survival of peoples.

* * *

Personnel for relief work abroad still is urgently needed by the American Friends Service Committee, with emphasis on administrators, accountants, truck drivers, mechanics, nutritionists, and secretary-stenographers. Young men and women with facility in languages are especially valuable. Some openings are available for young men 17 years of age and up. Information concerning specific jobs and occupational draft deferments may be obtained from the AFSC's Personnel Office, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia.

* * *

Madame Chiang Kai-shek is quoted as expressing to the Friends' Ambulance Unit in China her approval of a proposal to send young Quakers and persons holding similar views into Japan for humanitarian work. Madame Chiang's letter is reported to have said: "We harbored no ill-will against the Japanese people and were prepared, when the echoes of war had died away, to dwell in peace and amity with them as our near neighbors."

—*Worldover Press*

* * *

St. Stephen's Camp for Boys near Tunkhannock, Pa., needs the following camp personnel for the coming summer: director, assistant director, dietitian and several counselors. Further information can be obtained by writing to the Rev. William K. Russell, St. Stephen's Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

* * *

Marie E. Nilson, Wayside Hjemmen, Brookville, Ohio, wishes to communicate with a CO and his wife, who own a trailer and would like to park on a small plot of ground for the spring and summer with the privilege of sharing in the cultivation of a large garden and of processing garden produce for themselves.

* * *

The sudden death of Homer Nichols, CO who had served a term in Danbury and subsequently worked on parole at the Massachusetts General Hospital until recently, saddened his very many friends in the pacifist movement. Death came after an illness of only two weeks. Services were held in the Abyssinian Baptist Church, New York City, on March 17.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough. 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 1406 East 40th St., Seattle 5, Wash.; *Northern California:* Orval Etter, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 3302 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Eberhard, 440 E. 13th Ave., Denver 3, Colo.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 1850 E. 81st St., Cleveland 3, Ohio; *Middle Atlantic:* James E. Bristol, Room 900. 1831 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 3, Pa.; *Rural:* Leslie Simon, Peterboro, N. Y.

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

"Poor Little Rich Men"

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In his letter opposing organized labor's fight for higher rates, Passmore Elkinton has used a misleading index in his plea for the misunderstood industrialists who have been "doing cheerfully during the war an immensely increased amount of work for less than their peacetime rates of profit."

What Mr. Elkinton apparently has overlooked is that sales poured into industry with no effort on their part, and profits on *capital investment* leaped tremendously, in many cases several hundred per cent. Industry has made so much money it has voluntarily returned large sums, through the renegotiation of contracts procedure. This was not due to conscientious objection to war profits, but to the fear of public reaction when the huge profits might be exposed after the war.

What Mr. Elkinton has refused to consider is that the factory worker made his investment of time and energy (in many instances to the point of complete breakdown) and in return got a living and very little more, with the increased cost of living, enforced purchase of war bonds and high income tax. On the other hand the industrialist had his investment in capital stocks, which without any doubt increased in value many times and which is adequately protected by tax reserves, refund provisions and now (unfortunately) by rising prices in the inflation spiral.

In addition to this capital investment most industrialists had adequate salaries for their livelihood and support of their families. Whether unearned incomes increased phenomenally, outrageously, or merely considerably, is of slight interest to this Fellowshipper. Whether the workingman on his reduced hours (with the increased costs of living being forced by the owning groups so they can protect their rate of unearned income) can support his family and educate his children is, I submit, the concern of those who "strive to build a social order which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another, and which will assure to all the means for realizing the best possibilities of life."

Mr. Elkinton's point of the white collar workers "taking it in the neck" is I think, well taken. They'll continue to "take it" until they organize.

MARION CODDINGTON.

Fight for "Mansoul"

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Recently one of the farm lads of the neighborhood—a youngster whom we all knew and liked—returning from service badly crippled, went into his woodshed and shot himself. The whole neighborhood is deeply, deeply troubled; all of us wondering, I suppose, if we could have helped him in any way. As a soldier of World War I, I pause to wonder if humanity contains a human type more criminal than the civilian who likes the childish and toy-soldier side of war, the only side (and I am thinking of Franklin Roosevelt) he ever gets to see.

This morning when I lit the kitchen fire a little after sunrise, I looked out to see three deer feeding together scarce a stone's throw from the door. The morning was so still, the air so austere and pure, the morning light so radiant, that it might have been a picture from a fairy tale. Getting wind of me, they waited a moment or two to make up their minds, tossed up their white tails, and were off in a lovely, foolish scamper to the woods.

No, the destructionists shall not have our world! But it will mean a fight for Bunyan's city of "Mansoul," a fight to the last ditch and the last tower. But just now my poor young neighbor haunts me. God give him rest and peace.

HENRY BESTON.

Leader Wanted

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Unless we pacifists are so pessimistic that we also believe there is no hope against war, we must realize that what we need is a vivid, vigorous leader who will sweep the imaginations of men and make them yearn for brotherhood as they have in the past been made to yearn for liberty or justice or some other ideal.

God send pacifists a red-blooded man with words of lightning and a voice that nothing can silence! *A man who will not try to reason with people, who will not be so stupid as to think he can argue people into peaceful ways, who will not even start with a premise of Christianity.*

Brotherhood is fine. Brotherhood is glorious. It is a joyful experience and is thoroughly practical! With brotherhood we can have the international full dinner pail, two cars in every garage, and a fur coat for every lady! And without brotherhood, we can't!

We have been putting on the brakes. We have been saying "Please don't fight! Another war will bring the end of civilization!" when what we should have said was, "Think of the luxury and happiness we can have in the world when we are friends with everybody! Think how prosperous we can be in the world when there are no barriers between nations and everyone can travel without a visa anywhere in the world at two cents a mile, when every nation will produce the thing that it can the cheapest and sell it at the lowest possible rate so that luxuries that now are only possible at enormous sums will be available to everyone.

"And all this, if we just rest back and say, 'Well, after all Tito and Sergei and Fritz are people too and they want the same kind of happy family life that I want. Let's start now and share the world and have brotherhood!' "

Of course, I am just letting off steam. But I *do* intend it as a serious plea, as a deep prayer, as a cry to God for the kind of person who will put pacifism over to the multitude. For it is not being put over now, not by any of the organizations I support, the Friends, the FOR, the COs! They are all too calm, too coldly reasonable, too innately pessimistic!

We need an optimist, a person who believes that the world can be saved, and saved in our generation! God can still work miracles but he must have a mouthpiece! God send us a firebrand!

CHARLOTTE BRATE.

Healing War's Wounds

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The surest way to right a wrong is to make reparation. The surest way to combat the continuing horrors of World War II—which will not stop, but seem to go on and on as if to tie World War II to World War III—is to undo the wrong done our common humanity.

For five years men have destroyed; let us now rebuild. Let us rebuild in such a way as to show that what we have all suffered we will now all undo; what we have done to injure one another we will now wipe out, as far as we are able, by helping one another. Even symbolic action would help. Let Germans appear, under their own flags and as free men, to rebuild Rotterdam; let the British send groups to help rebuild Rotenburg; let Americans rebuild Dresden. Even a few hundred men, freely sent, and working gladly, knowing what they are doing, would do more to dispel the horrors of World War II, and perhaps even to banish the shadows of World War III, than any number of fine speeches.

Let the warmakers know that whatever they may do, the destruction of war will be followed by men rebuilding their lives and cities together, working willingly with and for each other, and thus unconsciously exposing the men who made the war and gloried in it as what they are. Let us do, not talk; let us help, with our own willing hands and arms, doing gladly the work called for by the indissoluble ties of our common humanity. And then we will see, with eyes grown clear, that brighter future our common victory over hate and fear will have made possible.

GILBERT C. PERLEBERG.

Pleas Answered

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Take heart! Be assured that although contributions toward FOR's worthy causes are not what they should be, yet through the instrument of your paper, contributions everywhere are increased.

I am the wife of a Baptist minister, and largely because of the appeals in FELLOWSHIP I am sending through Baptist channels a sum which I've been accumulating for months. I had hoped to use this $50 to attend the Northern Baptist Convention this spring, but I cannot! I *must* give this money to help feed the starving peoples of the world. So your pleas are being responded to, if sometimes by channels other than your own.

MARCIA S. NEUBERT.

More of the Strange Adventures of the Pacifist and the Guardian Angel, with a Reference, if only Fleeting, to the Wachahusett Chowder and Debating Society

THE Pacifist leaned back, loosened his galluses, and grunted happily. There being no response from the next chair, he glanced surreptitiously toward where his Guardian Angel worked busily over a flat piece of board. The sight made him feel vaguely uncomfortable, and he tried again to get his companion's attention.

"Sure feels good," said the Pacifist.

"Mm!" said the Guardian Angel.

"Nice to relax again," persisted the Pacifist.

"!" said the Guardian Angel.

"With the war over and all, I mean." The Pacifist suspected uneasily that he was losing ground, but he continued obstinately. "Of course things aren't really good yet," he admitted, "but the shooting's stopped and the boys are coming home from CPS camps and prisons and—Say, what are you so busy at, anyway? You haven't heard a word I said!"

The Guardian Angel brushed a spot of paint off one wing. "Getting ready for the picket line," he said absently, and peered at his work with a pleased expression. "How does it look?"

He held up a sign on which he had lettered neatly: "Guardian Angels Local 102 Demands Unemployment Insurance NOW!!!"

"Unemployment insurance!" gasped the Pacifist. "You're not thinking of leaving me?"

"Nope," said the Guardian Angel grimly. "You're getting ready to leave me. You and a lot of other animated atoms!"

"Oh, that!" The Pacifist relaxed. "You're getting too excited. That atom bomb business is much exaggerated. There's no real danger right away."

"Yeah!" said the Guardian Angel. "Sure! That's why the atomic scientists are running around screaming warnings. That's why your people at 2929 Broadway have circles under their eyes [1] from staying up nights trying to find ways of making a hundred thousand dollars to do the work of ten million. (And getting the hundred thousand!—Ed.) This country and Russia are calling each other names like a pair of fishwives; troops are marching in a hundred places all over the world; the Washington brass hats are winning their fight to militarize the country with peacetime conscription, and you say there's no danger!—You think I ought to underline that word *NOW?*"

The Pacifist tightened his galluses, glanced wistfully at his easychair, and stood up.

"Guess I quit too soon," he said meekly. "What shall I start on?"

"Attaboy!" crowed the Guardian Angel. "Now here's a list of things—

"First, we gotta get *Fellowship* to circulate much more widely. So start by getting new subscriptions to it. You've a lot of friends who're interested enough to want to read *Fellowship* if you give 'em a chance. And see that it's in your local libraries and on the desks of all the ministers in town. There's a project for your local FOR group," said the Guardian Angel.

"Yes, sir," said the Pacifist, and made a note on his cuff.

"Next," said the Guardian Angel, "you get going again on this conscription business. Write your congressman and senators, and *give anti-conscription flyers out to everybody you meet!* Hand them out in church, in that Wachahusett Who's it (there's that fleeting reference—Ed.) in your clubs and unions, and everywhere else. Send right away for the FOR's packet of three timely anti-conscription flyers. There's 125 flyers and the packet costs only one dollar."

"Yes, sir," said the Pacifist, pushing in his cuff and pulling out a checkbook.

"There's the famine situation," said the Guardian Angel soberly. "Get hold of *What's Happening in Europe and Asia.* That's only a dime—12 copies for a buck! Pass it out wholesale. Get some extra copies of the March *Fellowship,* too." (20c a copy —Ed.)

"Yes, sir," said the Pacifist, starting a second check.

"You doing anything for young people?" demanded the Guardian Angel. "No, of course not! You're not doing anything, period! Look, show sample copies of *The Forerunner* to your church people and get them to subscribe for all the high-school age kids in church. It's a swell little paper, and only fifty cents a year!" (A penny post-card will bring you other suggestions for distributing *The Forerunner,* too—Ed.)

"There's three new leaflets for Forerunners," said the Guardian Angel, "besides that *What's Happening* one. They're called *Nosing Out Prejudice, Calling All Congressmen,* and *Stories of Forerunners,* and they're only a dime each!"

"You know," said the Pacifist, happily writing a third check, "I wish we had something to counteract this 'All Germans are bad' propaganda!"

"Now you're cooking with nuclear physics," applauded the Guardian Angel. "Try Vera Brittain's (and George Catlin & Sheila Hodges—.75—Ed.) *Above All Nations.* It's full of stories of how fighting men of all nations did deeds of mercy and kindness for their enemies in the midst of the war."

"Yes, sir," said the Pacifist, and grinned. "Gee, this is like old times!"

"Never mind the reminiscences," said the Guardian Angel. "We gotta look forward now, not back. . . . Now look, my space is getting short and I may have to talk faster to squeeze in everything. I know you're tired and would like to relax, but you *can't!* This is as much of a crisis as the war ever was."

"I guess I oughta start reading again, hey?" asked the Pacifist meekly.

"*And* using what you read, *and* getting your friends to read, *and* writing letters to your newspapers," said the Guardian Angel.

"Yes, sir," said the Pacifist. "What books would you recommend, sir?"

"The newest one is Aldous Huxley's *Science, Liberty, and Peace.* The Fellowship edition is only fifty cents," said the Guardian Angel. "If you haven't read *Peace Is the Victory,* by Holmes, Page, Muste, Fosdick and nine other leading pacifists ($1.50) you'd better do that right away, and get copies to friends, too. And then there's Gregg's *Power of Non-Violence* ($2.00) and Muste's *Non-Violence in an Aggressive World* (.75) and send for the FOR Literature List, and now wait, my breath's getting short, but *don't put that checkbook away!* Have you sent in your FOR contribution yet?"

"No sir," said the Pacifist, "but I'll send it right away, with this order."

"All right," said the Guardian Angel, mollified, "and see that you make it a big one. . . . You can go back to sleep now if you feel like it."

"Huh!" said the Pacifist. "You sleep if you want to. I've got work to do!"

[1] We do, too!—The Staff.